BOOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVIII JANUARY, 1945 No. 295

Editorial Notes

WE strongly recommend our readers to procure a copy of the Report of the Joint Committees of the Convocations on the subject of Confirmation,[1] and not to be content with having seen the summaries of its contents that have appeared in the press. It is an admirable example of how a document should be prepared. The discussion of practical questions is preceded by a first-rate examination of the theological principles. The whole document deserves to be widely and carefully studied in the Church. At first sight we do not find it any easier than the signatories to decide which of the three possible lines of reform, which they propose, is to be preferred. We have only two criticisms to make at this stage. First, we do not see that experiments can satisfactorily be made along incompatible lines of reform at the same time. The resultant confusion is horrid to contemplate. Rather, the pros and cons of the three suggested remedies should be weighed throughout the Church, and then a decision reached as to which ought to be followed. Secondly, we consider that the objections to the separation of Confirmation from Baptism in the Western tradition ought to have been examined and answered, if they can be answered, on theological grounds. Readers of Dr Cross's Life of Dr Darwell Stone will remember how strongly he judged that the Western Church had in this matter gone astray, and it may be at least worth while to inquire whether the failure of this Report to reach an agreed conclusion is not due to the fact that its authors declined to consider thoroughly the only solution which is in the last resort theologically defensible.

* * * * * *

There is still room for much enlightenment of public opinion concerning the deplorable way in which the provision of books has been handled in this war. We would call attention to Mr Stanley Unwin's pamphlet, *Publishing in Peace and War* (George Allen and Unwin, 6d.). Even if the Government is persuaded now to take generous steps to redress its past mistakes, there will be an appalling shortage of books for a long time to come. What has already happened is a dismal indication of our national standard of values and also of the possibilities of the bureaucratic evasion of responsibility.

* * * * * *

The article in this number entitled "If I was Archbishop" was, of course, prepared before the death of Archbishop Temple. Readers must not run away with the idea that all or most senior boys in public

[1] *Confirmation To-day*. Press and Publications Board. 2s.

and secondary schools are equally interested in, and informed about, ecclesiastical affairs. Other schoolmasters have assured us that the boys who were examined by "S.A.C." must be regarded as in this respect exceptional and not typical. This may be due to the fact, which "S.A.C." notes, that they were all history specialists.

* * * * * *

Any subscribers to THEOLOGY who are willing to send on their copies to a missionary overseas are invited to communicate with Mrs Vibert, 18, Camden Crescent, Bath.

What is Anglican Theology?

THE discussion in THEOLOGY upon the nature of Anglican theology is timely. For there *is* such a thing as Anglican theology and it is sorely needed at the present day. But because it is neither a system nor a confession (the idea of an Anglican "confessionalism" suggests something that never has been and never can be) but a method, a use and a direction, it cannot be defined or even perceived as a "thing in itself," and it may elude the eyes of those who ask "What is it?" and "Where is it?" It has been proved, and will be proved again, by its fruits and its works.

The method, use and direction characteristic of Anglican divinity first came into clear light in the writings of Hooker. His theology claimed to do both far less and far more than the theologies of Calvin, of Luther and of Trent. It did less in that it eschewed any attempt to offer a complete scheme of Biblical doctrine, or an experiential assurance of justification or an infallibilist system of dogma. It did more in that it appealed to a larger field of authority and dealt with the whole man rather than with certain parts of him. For it appealed to Scripture, tradition and reason: "the Spirit everywhere in the scripture . . . laboureth to confirm us in the things which we believe by things whereof we have sensible knowledge." And it dealt with the whole man, both by its reverence for his reason and his conscience and by its refusal to draw a circle around the inward personal element in religion and to separate it from the world of external things. It was congruous with all this that the Incarnation, with the doctrine of the Two Natures, was central, and that the Church and the Sacraments were closely linked with the Incarnation. The claim of this theology to be "Catholic" rested not only upon its affinity with antiquity but upon the true "wholeness" of its authorities and of its treatment of man and his need. It offered him not only justification in his inward self but the sanctification of his whole being through sharing in the divine life.

The method, use and direction seen in Hooker persisted. Amid many diversities of emphasis there can be traced in Anglican divinity an appeal to Scripture which refuses to treat Scripture as a self-contained law or to select the doctrine of justification by faith as the essence of the Gospel, and insists instead that Scripture needs interpreting with

the aid of the tradition of the Church as the witness and keeper of holy writ. And with the appeal to Scripture on these lines there is linked both the study of the ancient Fathers and a reverence for reason and conscience such as commends authority while eschewing infallibilism. In the centuries between Hooker and to-day the different elements in the Anglican unity have often "gone apart." High-churchmen, valuing tradition but missing the more dynamic aspect of the Word in the Scriptures, have sometimes been led into a "traditionalism." Evangelicals, holding the Bible in high esteem but divorcing it from the living tradition of the Church, have sometimes been led into a "scripturalism." Broad-churchmen, reverencing reason but missing the significance of certain aspects of Scripture and tradition, have sometimes been led into a sort of "rationalism." In each case there has been a tearing asunder of things which in the Anglican vocation are bound together—the Gospel, the Catholic Church, sound learning. Yet the underlying unity, often strained and never to be defined, has not perished. The special importance of F. D. Maurice is that while he fell foul of the advocates of the "isms" of his day—"churchism," "evangelicalism," "liberalism" alike—he is now seen to represent in a remarkable way the unity which they were missing.

The Anglican use can be studied with profit in many divines of the last three and a half centuries. It is illustrated in the width of Lancelot Andrewes' appeal to "the whole Church, Eastern, Western, our own," in Bishop Butler's use of the inductive method, in the title of the first of the Tracts for the Times, in James Mozley's famous passage upon the limitations of logic (*Essay in Development*, pp. 41-4), in F. D. Maurice's insistence upon the distinction between the truth of God and the forms wherein it is expressed, in the editing of *The Library of the Fathers*, in Frederick Temple's plea for the rights of the student ("if you prescribe the conclusions you preclude the study"), and in modern works which expound the Incarnation in its relation to the evolution of man and nature while fully conserving its unique, redemptive and transcendental character. These illustrations suggest many a tension between diverse elements, yet the underlying unity is there and Hooker may still show us something of its meaning. Unfortunately there has been a false view of this unity which thinks of it as a vague "comprehensiveness" embracing all and sundry opinions for comprehensiveness' sake. But this notion does less than justice to the true unity of Anglican divinity. For it is not a unity *between* diverse "isms" and parties but a deeper unity *in* the Gospel of God, *in* the Catholic Church whereof the Church of England is a part, and *in* sound learning.

Now the Anglican use, method and direction discovered themselves in reaction from the pressure of Luther, Calvin and Trent; and it is possible that in the reaction against misleading systems there was a missing of certain valuable elements which those systems contained. Thus, though the Anglican method led to a balanced use of Scripture as interpreted by tradition and to an escape from the lopsidedness of the Reformed scripturalism, there may yet have been loss through the missing of the more "dynamic" use of Scripture known amongst the Reformed. In other words our emphasis (right as it has been) upon

the "Word made flesh" may have led us to miss something of the meaning of the "Word spoken" as Reformed Christianity values it. Similarly the reaction against Rome may have led to loss through our neglect of the angelic doctor, from whom Hooker himself had learnt not a little. The day of revenge has come. The catastrophic times through which we have been passing have exposed the contemporary weaknesses of the Anglican use. Can it offer the wholeness of system which the Thomist offers? Does it sufficiently understand the notes of crisis and judgment which the Confessional Protestant has been making his own? It has seemed that Anglicanism has had less to say and has said it less powerfully than these two theologies upon its flanks. Its members often look to them rather than to their mother, and ask "Has she a theology of her own?"

But history may soon repeat itself, and, as in the latter days of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Anglican divinity may soon rediscover itself and, while claiming to say far less than the Schoolman and the Confessionalist, may speak both *with* a wider authority than they and *to* the whole man rather than to a part of him. For on the one side every sort of infallibilism demands (as James Mozley pointed out in the work already mentioned) an infallible logician, and this means an authority speaking to far less than the whole man. And on the other side Neo-Calvinism leads us to regard the use of our reason as a sinful titanism, and so dwells on our justification as to rob us of our sanctification through union with the divine life. If these judgments be true, the Anglican need not be too diffident or apologetic, though he may need to be more modest, in what he claims to say.

(1) The *bona fide* Anglican can never suffer the Latin scholastics to dominate the theology of his Church. This refusal need not involve a depreciation of what the scholastics can do in the field of Christian philosophy. But the refusal must be made, because the scholastic would substitute other categories than those of the Bible at the very heart of theology, where the Anglican believes that only the Biblical categories can rule. "I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for therein is revealed a righteousness of God from faith unto faith": the appeal to Scripture demands that God's revelation be understood first in these Biblical categories with the Greek of the New Testament as the theologian's primary apparatus. It is here that the quarrel really lies. This is not to deny that a far more humble and ready appreciation of the scholastic's work is needed amongst us; but this is to say that he can never be suffered to possess the central shrine.

(2) Equally the *bona fide* Anglican is not at home with the divinity broadly and somewhat incorrectly called Barthian. It would be futile to belittle what has been learnt and needs to be learnt from the Barthian school concerning the failure of the "liberal" treatment of the Bible, the realities of God's transcendence, grace and judgment, and the more truly theological perspective in Biblical interpretation. Yet the Anglican's gratitude for this is no longer leaving him blind to the need for revolt and protest, akin to the revolt and protest of Hooker against the Calvinism of his day. A concentration upon the Word spoken which misses the importance of the Word made flesh, a concentration

upon justification which as good as denies the theme of sanctification, a concentration upon certain elements in St Paul which omits the teaching of St John (particularly chapters vi and xvii) from its picture of Christianity, betoken a divinity which is less than truly Biblical. Nor can the Anglican fail to notice the loosening of the Neo-Calvinists' hold upon the Incarnation as a central principle. Partly this is seen in a failure to make that estimate of Man which the Incarnation demands. Partly this is seen in a readiness (observable in different degrees in some writers) to part with the idea of the Incarnation itself, since if all that is needed is "an irruption into history for man's salvation" there is no special importance in the doctrine of God made Man.

Now Anglican divinity rediscovers itself by the recognition that it is of a mode and spirit other than these. It could never, for the truth's sake, leave the field to them. But it can do its work only with a careful recognition of its debt to them, even as Hooker owed much to the Rome and the Calvin whom he withstood. There seems to lie before Anglican divinity the immense task which is also an immense opportunity: to appeal once again to the threefold authority of scripture, tradition and reason: not to repeat in archaic fashion the appeal as it was made in the sixteenth century, but to discover its new mode as it is needed today.

(1) As to Scripture the way is open for a treatment that avoids the errors and the violence of much modern work. The liberal method drew out the human nature of the Bible but misinterpreted it through losing its theological key. In reaction the "new school" has recovered a belief in the divine nature of the Bible but has often refused a due place to its human nature by ignoring questions of historicity, by trying to settle critical problems by theological affirmations, and by oversimplifying the rough, jagged process wherein the theology was hammered out in the history. Is there not need for a treatment of Biblical questions, an exposition of Biblical themes, an assessment of Biblical authority which holds in view the Two Natures of the Bible? And is this not a task akin to that which Hooker performed in a different though cognate field?

(2) But the interpreter of Scripture cannot work without presuppositions, and the disciple of Hooker approaches the Bible with presuppositions learnt from the living tradition of the Church. But the appeal to tradition cannot mean to-day precisely what it meant in the sixteenth century or in the writings of the Tractarians. It needs rethinking. In place of a static appeal to the undivided Church (for the Holy Ghost has said many things since the great schism) we should perhaps think in terms of the appeal to Christian experience. This appeal will put the utmost emphasis upon the inward experience of Christians and its moral fruits; but it will not, in the manner of Hooker's opponents, draw a closed circle around the inward aspect of the Christian life. It will instead include the form and the sacramental life of the Church in their witness to the historical givenness of the Gospel. Though the form without the Spirit is dead, it is through His use of the form—in creed, sacrament, order, liturgy—that the Spirit

preserves the true salt of Christian life in its union with the objectivity of Gospel and Church.

(3) As to the appeal to reason the writer of this paper would rather that others, with a philosophical equipment which he lacks, took up the tale. But perhaps the nature of the Anglican's appeal to reason may be discovered partly from the nature of the appeal to Scripture and tradition, and partly from the distinction (deep in the Anglican's bones) between authority and infallibility. "Two things there are that trouble these latter times: one is that the Church of Rome cannot, another that Geneva will not err." Where is the secret of a theology which does not require the infallible logician and yet "proves all things" as the apostle said, and speaks not to part of a man but to the whole of him, *justifying and sanctifying and illuminating* body, soul and spirit whole and entire unto the coming of the Lord?

In these t sks the Anglican will not suppose that he has a system or a Confession that can be defined and commended side by side with those of others; indeed, the use of the word "Anglicanism" can be very misleading. Rather will he claim that his tasks look beyond "isms" to the Gospel of God and to the Catholic Church which he tries to serve with a method, use and direction needed as greatly to-day as in the past. *Loquere filiis Israel ut proficiscantur.*

A. M. Ramsey.

Durham.

Oliver Quick as a Theologian—I

I. In the year 1912 there appeared in the January number of the *Journal of Theological Studies* a long article entitled "The Value of Mysticism," by a young man who had left Oxford not many years before and had become Vice-Principal of Leeds Clergy School. The writings of W. R. Inge, Friedrich von Hügel and Evelyn Underhill had led to a greatly increased interest in this subject. It was easy to feel the appeal of mysticism as first-hand religious experience; much less easy to understand it and to make the understanding the result of a sympathetic but critical appreciation of its character. It was no light task to which an expositor of the value of mysticism would put his hand.

It was a task for which Oliver Quick was already admirably fitted. He had sufficient, if not encyclopedic, knowledge of his subject. He possessed that coolness and clarity of intellect which was to set its distinguishing mark on all his work, a natural capacity which he never allowed to be weakened by any lack of practice in the high art of thinking. His remarkable powers of analysis always pointed in the direction of synthesis; and at the heart of religious synthesis was the creed of the Incarnation, the Cross, and the Resurrection. To him they were, in the fullest sense, life-giving verities, and in this early work of his one is already conscious of the theme, grand in its simplicity and in its unfolding harmonies, which he was to expound in his later writings, of which, before we come to closer contact with his theology, a brief survey may first be made.

First came *Modern Philosophy and the Incarnation*, a work of value

quite disproportionate to its comparative brevity. This was followed in 1916 by *Essays in Orthodoxy*, and its general character is already visible in the sub-heading to the Introduction, "Restatement or Explanation?" re-enforced as that is by two later sentences: "The first necessity is not to restate the creeds, but to explain them. Perhaps after the explanation, the need for restatement will not seem so pressing." But Quick was never content to be just a defensive apologist. He wished to explore, not to mark time, being convinced that in respect of "the older trinitarian orthodoxy" it was desirable to "dig deeper into the field which it defines." *The Testing of Church Principles*, which came out in 1919, is a more ephemeral work, a contribution made in what Quick held to be "a critical hour in the life of the Church of England." A much more important volume is *Liberalism, Modernism and Tradition*, containing the Bishop Paddock Lectures of 1922. In it Quick gives a singularly fair and discriminating account of the contrasted positions of the Ritschlians (particularly of Ritschl himself) and of the Roman Catholic Modernists, with a quite first-rate exposition of the historic orthodox tradition and of its outcome in Christology. In the following year appeared *Christian Beliefs and Modern Questions*, which owed a good deal to *Essays in Orthodoxy* but had the needs of Christian apologetic more definitely in view. The volume *Liberalism*, etc., has something of a sequel in *Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity* (1924); but I do not regard the lectures there incorporated as of equal value. The book has its particular merits but is less of a whole, and Quick was not on ground that he knew well when he was interpreting Protestant belief and emphasis in their historic or in their Anglican forms.

With *The Christian Sacraments*, published in "The Library of Constructive Theology" in 1927, Quick may be said to have reached the height of his powers. It is the most important contribution to sacramental theology which has come from the Church of England during the present century; to aspects of it I must return later on. Two books belong to 1931. *The Realism of Christ's Parables* has its origin in a course of lectures; it is brief and not "scientifically" important, and is now and then over-subtle; but it is often illuminating as to the nature and implications of our Lord's teaching. The Sion College Lectures entitled *The Ground of Faith and the Chaos of Thought* must at times have made considerable demands upon their hearers—but not through any lack of clearness. They, especially when taken along with *The Gospel of Divine Action* (1932), give us the sum of Quick's reflections upon the modern religious situation. The latter book is enriched by one of the most valuable incursions Quick ever made into Biblical theology, the comparison of St Paul and St John.

In 1938, when Quick was nearing the end of his time as Professor at Durham, his longest and most systematic work was published. Here, as often, lectures, in this case to Durham students, prepared the way for the book and formed its substance. On this book and on *The Christian Sacraments* Quick's reputation as a theologian will mainly rest. During his comparatively brief tenure of the Regius Chair at Oxford, Quick produced no further work other than the pamphlet *Christianity and Justice* (1940), in the Christian News-Letter series; but it is most

fortunate that it has been found possible to prepare for publication lectures on the Atonement, which under the title *The Gospel of the New World*, give his final teaching on the Christian doctrine of salvation. And it is appropriate that that should be so, since for Quick, as truly as for P. T. Forsyth, very different though their ways of approach and characteristic expressions of the truth might be, Christianity was the religion that had as its centre the atoning and saving work of Christ; it was the fruit of His cross and resurrection.

II. The background of Quick's concern with the strictly intellectual aspects of religion and Christianity was his Oxford training in philosophy. He was an exact thinker, who was always putting his mind to work. He had the wariest of eyes when he came across anything of the nature of a catch-phrase. Thus, in *Liberalism*, etc., he gives the warning that "those who praise the concrete universal do not always remember that there is no more dangerous abstraction than the concept of mere concreteness." In philosophy he was not committed to any one school. He was not a Christian Platonist after the fashion of Dr W. R. Inge, his illustrious Dean at St Paul's. He was, indeed, a rationalist, if the word be used in no narrow sense and without the unfortunate connotations that have come to be associated with it. The sections "Reason and Logic," "The Meaning of Rationality," "Reason and Faith united in Christianity," near the beginning of *The Doctrines of the Creed* give us his mind on this subject.

Any considerable acquaintance with Quick's writings will bring the reader to the realization of two facts: first, that Quick had a most remarkable power of clarifying the meaning of words. His discussion of "cause" and "reason" in *The Gospel of Divine Action* is the outstanding example and of great value. I would mention also the paper on "Power" and "Love" in *Christian Beliefs*, etc. Secondly, the reader will be impressed by the cogency of Quick's criticisms. These, while never aggressive in manner, are always to the point, and sometimes quite deadly in character, as when he exposes the logical results of Mr Walter Lippmann's conclusion about evil that "evil exists only because we feel it to be painful." Having dealt briefly but faithfully with this affirmation Quick remarks that "the truth is that Mr Lippmann, like many of our modern sceptics, is at once far too good a man and too confused a thinker to accept the consequences of his own reasoning. He really intends his book to be a *preface* to morals and not, as his own logic would suggest, their epitaph."

It was Quick's clarity of mind which enabled him to write about the conceptions of the mathematical physicists and of the notions of Deity in the works of Professor A. N. Whitehead and Sir James Jeans as though he had received a mathematical and scientific training and were thereby qualified to be a thoroughly competent expositor and interpreter. I find the ten pages which he devoted to this theme in *The Ground of Faith*, etc., among the most interesting and even entertaining that Quick ever wrote. He had a sense of humour which was both dry and lively, like good champagne. In these pages he had occasion to deal with the word "event" as used by mathematical physicists and to show that if the whole truth about the universe is

given in mathematical measurements there can no more be real events than real material things. He proceeds: "The word 'event' is only used because it seems a convenient one to represent a term in a series mathematically conceived. The word 'perambulator' would do just as well except that it is cumbrous and too suggestive of an event which is really interesting." The same book contains his fullest consideration of the Barthian theology. I suppose that Barth and Quick were as far removed from one another as it is possible for Christian theologians to be, while remaining *eminenti sensu* Christian theologians. That is not a good starting-point for an understanding which should not lose all sympathy, though predominantly critical. Nevertheless, Quick's capacity for understanding carries him a long way, and if the understanding is not sympathetic it is not the reverse. In his criticism two points deserve special notice: the first, which must have struck many even sympathetic students of Barth, is that if the human reason and conscience are in themselves utterly worthless for any true knowledge of the true God, it is impossible to see how the truth about God can be brought home to man, so that he accepts it as the truth. The other point is that the source of the Barthian's difficulty "lies in this, that from the beginning certainty, rather than truth, was the dominant aim of his quest." And so "the intense, passionate objectivity of his theology was really determined from the beginning by the subjectivity of his personal interest." Quick may over-press this contention, and I am sure that in the question which ends the chapter, "and yet how far is it true that 'the theology of crisis' is but a gesture of intellectual impatience after all?", the words "but" and "after all" will not do. Yet the point he is making is not negligible. I would add two brief remarks before passing from Quick's attitude to the Barthian theology. The first is that he had not read the first volume of Barth's Dogmatic, translated into England with the title *The Doctrine of the Word of God*. This might, but not certainly, have affected his judgment of Barth's theology. And, further, he recognizes an important fact about Barth and Brunner when he writes: "It is certain that they do much after their own fashion both to rationalize and moralize the Biblical theology."

III. Quick would generally be regarded as a philosophical theologian, which would not be an untrue account of him. Nevertheless his theology is dependent through and through on the Biblical faith in God as the living God who reveals Himself to and in the world He has made. In sharpest antithesis "the Platonic God could not act phenomenally and remain God." So Quick writes in *Liberalism*, etc. It is in the emphasis upon God's action that the essence of his doctrine of God is to be found. That action finds its supreme expression in the Person and Work of Jesus Christ. "Christians believe," he writes in *The Doctrines of the Creed*, "that in Jesus Christ God's whole purpose for mankind stands once for all revealed and accomplished." In *The Ground of Faith*, etc., he affirms in respect of Christ's passion "intimate connexion between the uniqueness of its character and the universality of its significance." And in accordance with all this Quick's doctrine of God was not a Christianized Hellenism, ill at ease with the particularity

of the historical revelation in Christ. With all his differences from the Liberal Protestants he is far nearer to them than to the Catholic Modernists when he writes, "the religion of the historical Incarnation must always admit some sort of final appeal to the historical life which was its origin" (*Catholic and Protestant*, etc.). Clearly there could be no question of such an appeal apart from belief in the particular and final revelation of God in Jesus Christ, in His life and in His teaching.

But what then are we to make of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns' severe criticism of Quick in a review of *The Christian Sacraments* in the *Journal of Theological Studies*? He describes Quick's work as suffering from "an almost complete lack of real sense of history." He finds this weakness apparent when Quick "refuses to deal historically with the significance of the words spoken in the Upper Room and justifies himself by saying that their meaning can only be understood 'when we consider what He was, has been, and is in the history of human life and thought.' This is a very dangerous utterance." I think it would be fair to say that the interpretation of Scripture in terms of the particular and restricted character of the historical situation and background out of which this or that event and the record of it arose was not natural to Quick, and that where Hoskyns was pre-eminently strong Quick was much less competent because less interested. In this province Hoskyns was the extremely well-trained and practised professional, Quick the amateur. But in his understanding of the Christian religion Quick did not lack a real sense of history, and I doubt very much whether Hoskyns would have made the same criticism had he been reviewing any other of Quick's major works. It is not, for instance, the sign of a defective historical sense when in *Liberalism*, etc., Quick affirms that "the true and full personality of Jesus Christ must include all that He ever was and has ever become, and nothing in the New Testament is clearer than that the events recorded in the synoptic Gospels are intended to be taken only as one chapter of the life of Jesus Christ."

So I come to Quick's Christology in its main features and in points of special interest. Where some Modernist theologians have seemed hesitating and embarrassed, Quick was absolutely firm and decisive. Again and again he insists on the truth for which historical orthodoxy has always stood, that "Jesus Christ in the fundamental principle of His being was not man but God." As against Brunner he rejects the notion that though the Son of God did truly descend and became man, His divine *nature* "remained external to the incarnation." "To me," says Quick, "the suggestion that God, *but not deity*, became incarnate is unintelligible." At the same time he was critical of the way in which the patristic doctrine, as formulated at Chalcedon, came to be employed. In *The Gospel of Divine Action* he puts it in this way, that "the saving act of God in the manhood of Jesus is the one thing left unrepresented and unconveyed in the theological statement." It is at this point that he breaks with the patristic and scholastic doctrine of impassibility, since, with that starting-point, "it seems to follow that Jesus Christ suffered and was subject to limitation only as man, and that as God He Himself remained unaffected by any of the human experiences which involved suffering or limitation" (*Doctrines of the Creed*). How far removed

Quick was from the main lines of Greek thought on the subject of deity may be seen in his statement that "Hellenic theology cannot say that in Jesus it is God who acted; for if He acted, He also 'suffered.'" What is particularly interesting in Quick's Christology, and requires fuller treatment than is possible here, is that he combines the notion of the permeation of the manhood by the Godhead, since "nothing less than permeation is what is required by the gospel facts and by Christian experience" (*Liberalism*, etc.), with a very far-reaching kenotic doctrine. "The Son of God," he writes in his systematic work, "took upon Himself both the human fullness and the human limitations of a created personality which, through His self-identification with it, became the personal expression of Himself as man." So, with reference to the consciousness of Christ, he makes "very tentatively" his conjecture. "There was in Jesus what we should call a human ego. He thought of Himself, and thought truly, as being the Man Jesus, the Son of Mary. And being thus conscious of Himself as a human being, He could not be fully conscious of Himself as the eternal Son and Word of God. The divine person and nature were indeed fully present in the human, as the human were assumed into the divine, but they were not fully present to the consciousness of the incarnate. Nevertheless they were not wholly hidden from that consciousness. . . . He would have been in a limited yet growing degree conscious that, though He was a man, He was yet more than man, that His humanity was the earthly vessel through which the divine love, which He knew to be *His own*, was accomplishing its redemptive work."

On this I would make the following brief comments. First, this is not a revised doctrine of two persons, of the divine Son *and* a human Jesus. Secondly, Quick is quite clear about the *mysterium Christi*: he is not trying to explain or explain it away psychologically. Thirdly, it is obvious that Quick's conception of the nature of Christ's consciousness would need to be, at least, greatly modified if the Fourth Gospel were taken as evidence for the thoughts and words of Jesus Christ. Quick's chapter on "The Christology of John" is silent on the historical problem. Fourthly, what Quick says of the growth of Christ's consciousness recalls Forsyth's two great chapters on the kenosis and the plerosis in *The Person and Place of Jesus Christ*. But Forsyth worked out as a theology what in Quick is not much more than an introduction.

J. K. Mozley.

London. (*To be concluded.*)

"If I was Archbishop"

Some time ago I made an analysis of a number of examination papers, from a public school, which related to the ideas and views about religious questions in general held by boys between thirteen and fifteen years of age.[1] More recently I have had occasion in a different

[1] Theology, April, 1942, pp. 211-20.

public school to set the essay "If I was Archbishop of Canterbury" to an intelligent fifth and sixth form of boys whose ages ranged from sixteen to eighteen. The boys were all history specialists, who may therefore be adjudged to have some idea of the traditional place an archbishop occupies in the Anglican Church. They represented a cross-section of upper-middle-class, professional society. An analysis of their replies is, I venture to think, suggestive of a number of important points. It discloses the very real interest which the boys have in the position and policy of leading churchmen. Some of the answers at least were grounded on experience of parochial life. All, I think, felt that the Archbishop must take the lead in a positive policy which would lead the Church out of the doldrums of complacency. Finally, when the Church is so often guided by men of "wisdom and experience"—and of mature age—it is now and again heartening and instructive to examine the recommendations and suggestions of youth, however crudely expressed. This is perhaps more particularly important in view of the recent report on "Training for the Ministry" issued by the Archbishops' Commission.

Two or three ideas knit all the answers together into a single whole. All boys were aware of the decline in church membership since Victorian times, even if the causes, as they analysed them, varied from the spread of Fascism to the prevalence of drunkenness and immorality. In fact, the general attitude was summed up by one boy in the sentence: "The Church is being held back in many of its good intentions, not by spirited opposition, but by a generally apathetic atmosphere." He went on: "This is not because the people do not care, though it comes to that of course, but because they do not know anything about the Church in the first place." Apart from their awareness of the barriers to the spread of the Church's influence, two other considerations were present in the boys' minds, their feeling that reform was absolutely essential and their conviction that the Church, under the Archbishop's lead, could and would undertake the reform. An essayist, who affirmed that he was personally opposed to "red-headed reform," ended up by saying: "The Church needs almost a revolution to place it in its proper position in the community, and to bring about this revolution revolutionary bishops are needed." It was everywhere acknowledged that the Archbishop's position was a singularly difficult one—"if we were placed in their position we would realize what they are up against"—but it was generally agreed that the Archbishop represented and formulated Church policy. "It is the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, with all due respect to Churchill, holds the higher office, who should give us our lead in religion in time of war and peace."

The suggestions, criticisms—for frankness was demanded of the essayists—and recommendations put forward in these forty-odd papers may be roughly analysed as follows:

(1) *Church and State.*—There were only two definite demands for disestablishment, but there was general dissatisfaction with the method of appointing bishops and with Parliament's powers over the Church.

(2) *Church and Politics.*—There was one definite complaint against the Church's intervention in political matters as against a very considerable

number of answers demanding greater contact still. Two excerpts may be quoted:

"Religion should go hand in glove with politics—this in its highest form of perfection would rid the world of the somewhat 'shady' side of politics—people would accept the Church's intrusion into politics as natural."

Or again, more outspoken still:

"The Common Wealth party is not quite ideal because Sir R. Acland, though a strong Christian himself, does not insist on Christianity in his political programme. What we want is a similar party which *does* insist on Christianity and will place Christian morals and standards above all else."

(3) *Church and Morality.*—There can be no question of the whole-hearted approval given to a strong line in social and moral matters:

"The Archbishop should attempt to right many social evils by (*a*) associating churches with social welfare centres [in passing, the one boy who mentioned it definitely approved the Coventry Cathedral scheme]; (*b*) waging an extensive war on venereal diseases and other sexual wrongs; (*c*) clamour in the House of Lords for the improvement in the general education of the people, reduction of working hours per week, abolition of unemployment, reduction of taxation."

It was felt that there was greater room still for what may be vaguely called "social solidarity" between the higher clergy and people. "It is," wrote one sprightly essayist, "useless for a man—however pious or devoted a Christian—to call himself 'leader' of a Church when his life is quite aloof from that of the common layman. The attitude of the working man is: 'Oh, I know Cantuar. is a jolly good fellow, a righteous old cove and all that; but his way of life is not my way of life, and how can I possibly attain to such perfection myself?' "

(4) *The Clergy.*—It was felt by all writers that the Archbishop and his fellow-bishops were responsible for the selection and appointment of the clergy, and a great deal of space was given to the varied problems relating to these points. Every boy was convinced of the need for greater financial stability (which, added one answer, would draw more "gentlemen" into the Church, a consideration put forward by Bishop Pecock in defence of endowments as early as the fifteenth century). One boy urged a minimum stipend of £800 and another of £1,000, but the more general attitude was summed up in the following excerpt:

"I would see that all the clergy should have a handsome fixed salary. In the past century the parson has had so little money at his disposal that he has been unable to do more than make a living in a very trying way."

Considerable appreciation of the work of the clergy in town and country alike was shown, but, having said so much, it is only right to chronicle the *catena* of complaints which followed. Let the extracts tell their own tale.

"There are some old parsons that are completely decadent, and not only useless but harmful in their obstructing way. I speak from first-hand experience, and have heard people say that they really can't go to church when the rector is a man like that. Something must be done, and something drastic, to get rid of these doddering old obstructionists. Younger men should take their

place, as far as possible, young men who are capable of commanding the respect of the younger generation."

"I begin," says one boy, "with the state of the so-called Church of England, which so far from being a Church of England is a safe and peaceful refuge for all those members of the upper and middle classes who are too indifferent or too idle to hold any religious views whatsoever."

"I know," wrote another boy, "of a specific instance in a certain county where the Bishop was kind-hearted and refused no one when it came to selecting vicars. The result was that the half-mad, the impostors, the eccentric, were given parishes to the detriment of the Church."

"Finally," wrote a fourth boy, "I should share the belief of Sir Roger de Coverley, who insists that, in his parish, the sermons should either be preached out of an approved book, or be presented by orators of undisputed renown. A sermon should be delivered in such a way that, from the start, the congregation's imagination should be gripped by the devout words of the preacher, otherwise boredom ensues, followed by empty pews and evil deeds."

Others complained of "monotonous rumblings," lack of visiting (the Roman Catholic Church had in this way made a favourable impression on some), narrowmindedness and failure to make their churches social and spiritual centres of the parish.

Many boys suggested that episcopal control over the clergy should be greater than it is, that far more clergy should be deprived of their posts for neglect of duty, that a retiring age should be strictly enforced, and, by some two or three, that inspectors should be appointed by the archbishops and bishops to see that the clergy did undertake their cure of souls in a proper manner.

(5) *Church Services.*—While there were a number of suggestions for brighter services and better sermons, the most general recommendation was the suggestion that the Communion service should be restored to its original position as the chief service of the Church.

(6) *Church and Dogma.*—Many boys clearly felt that Anglicanism was as yet too indefinite, and not only urged greater discipline of conduct and membership but a more definite discipline of belief, or as one boy put it:

"A man without a religion is like a ship without a rudder. There are many men, including great men like Cardinal Newman, who at some time or another cannot clearly define their religion and are in other words 'rudderless.' They look for some port and usually become Roman Catholic. Why? Simply because the doctrine of the Church of England is too comprehensive. A doctrine should if possible be clearly defined, and if people want to be members of the Church of England they should have to make petty sacrifices and not adapt their own doctrine to suit themselves."[1]

These recommendations were those most frequently put forward by this representative group, only two members of whom, as far as I know,

[1] *Cf.* this, however, with another answer: "One wonders whether the insistence on the dogma of the Church's faith is necessary. In the present suffering and chaotic period of our history, surely the Church will not regain its once tremendous hold on society until it stresses the infinite magnitude of the charity of Christ's teaching:

'Alas for the rarity
Of Christian charity
Under the sun. . . .'"

are contemplating ordination; but other *varia* included greater use of religious broadcasting and films, suggestions relating to religious education and missionary work, approval of the South India scheme (by the one boy who mentioned it), election of bishops and clergy, need for discreet advertising, diminution of class prejudice, and greater use of discussion groups.

It is not pretended that anything revolutionary can be learned from this frank analysis and criticism, but it is as well now and again to try to understand what the young citizens of to-morrow are thinking about the Church of England. Finally, it is encouraging because it shows that some young men at least have an awareness of these problems not always vouchsafed to their elders, and it is tremendously important because of the air of expectancy about the future which these suggestions disclose.

S. A. C.

St Peter's Silence on the Petrine Claims

Dr Norman Sykes, in his review of Dr Jalland's *The Church and the Papacy* in Theology for October, comments on the significant omission of the *Petros-petra* text (Matt. xvi, 18) by St Mark. But there is an equally significant omission, not often emphasized, in St Peter's own writings. In the second chapter of his first Epistle (which I assume to be authentic) the Apostle uses the current pun on our Lord's name, χρηστός for Χριστός. Immediately afterwards he writes: "To whom coming, as to a living stone . . ." (λίθον ζῶντα). Neither the thread of thought nor the reason for the metaphor is obvious, and I feel at liberty to suggest that the pun on the name of our Lord prompted Peter to think of Christ's similar pun in *Petros-petra*, and to use the word ζῶντα from his affirmation in Matthew xvi, 16: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος."

Whether this is the original nexus of thought or not, at any rate in what follows St Peter is clearly expounding the symbol of the rock (πετρά, ver. 8) and the subsidiary stones. His interpretation is unambiguous: Christ is both the Rock of Offence and also the Cornerstone; all the faithful can become living stones in the spiritual house of God. Not a word about a special Rock called Peter, and not a hint that the Church is to have any foundation except Christ. It is inconceivable to me that Peter, even if he were the most modest of men, could have failed to safeguard his own authority and the organization of the Church by an explicit statement here, if he believed in anything like the present Roman Petrine claims.

W. B. Stanford.

Trinity College,
Dublin.

Survey of Educational Books

Books submitted for this survey during the past year have been few, and it cannot be said that many have broken up new ground. This limitation may be expected to obtain until the Church assigns a clearer function to religious education, notably in two directions. The Final

Report on Training for the Ministry has plainly decided against the teaching work of the clergy as an examined subject for the G.O.E., and there are as yet no indications that the Church has been able to connect realistically the work of religious education with the acknowledged needs of a new evangelism. So long as the radius remains unchanged the circumference of the circle must remain what it was, and new publications may be expected to reflect the circumscription.

For these reasons a little book, *Religious Teaching in Schools*, by A. C. Toyne (Religious Education Press, 1s. 6d.), deserves special attention as an attempt to break out of the circle, and contains the most important plea for religious education that has been heard for many years. Unfortunately the author's judgments are sometimes jejune: the suggestion that someone should write a book that would relate ethics with "man's beliefs about God" (p. 19) will cause surprise amongst theologians, and Mr Toyne is also rather militantly unaware of the extent to which his own synthetic presentation of the Christian faith and life merely reproduces the common teaching of the Churches in this century.

None the less it would be a thousand pities if this kind of colour-blindness were to hinder his message, which comes from one who feels the frustrations of teaching Scripture in secondary schools, and would begin such a course with a thorough study of *The Pilgrim's Progress* (p. 56). This practical suggestion is in fact the key to his thesis. After a long experience of teaching Scripture, he has reached the conviction that the work of a school is to teach "religion" (his own term), using the Bible only as a means to that end, and not, as at present, an end in itself. His essay is an honest attempt to grapple with the problems of ways and means, and will be read with the more attention because it is not the expression of an *ex parte* standpoint.

With the publication of Part V Fr H. A. Wilson concludes his *Haggerston Catechism* (Mowbrays, 1s. 9d.). Those who are looking for lesson books that contain an outline which clergy, or their teachers, can readily pass on to their children will not find in this series quite what they want. So many can produce that kind of lesson, but Fr Wilson is in his own way inimitable, for he has distilled out of his own pastoral experience what may be called a catechist's *apéritif*. You can't make a meal out of it; but *Haggerston Catechism* can make all the difference to the meal that follows. One would like to present a complete set to all young clergy, in the expectation that the author's love of the children and the Catechism would be an inspiration and tonic to all who make weekly lessons.

The Presentation of the Old Testament by N. L. Pritchard (Nat. Soc. and S.P.C.K., 3s.) and *The Background of the Life of Jesus* by W. H. Oldaker (Nat. Soc. and S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.) cover again an important field. A real service has been rendered by the reissue of Miss Hetty Lee's *Lessons on the Life of our Lord Jesus Christ* (Nat. Soc. and S.P.C.K., 5s.). The author has given to the Church the work of a really great teacher, and her lessons, which show the marks of that greatness, are much too good to go out of print. They are as valuable to-day as when originally published.

In what they call "Corporate Mental Action" the editors of the series *Unto a Full-Grown Man* discovered something really important to all who are getting young people (of fourteen+) together for worship and instruction. This year's volume deals with *Common Prayer* (Nat. Soc. and S.P.C.K., 3s.), and its author, the Rev. H. de Candole, is a guarantee that it is full of good and useful things.

J. R. Lumb.

Chislehurst.

BOOK REVIEWS

Are the New Testament Documents Reliable? By F. F. Bruce. The Inter-Varsity Fellowship. 1s.

The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels. By R. V. G. Tasker. S.C.M. Press. 5s.

These two books together pose the question of the most profitable approach to Biblical apologetics. Mr Bruce, who comes to his subject as a teacher of classics, has written a book which is apologetic in the customary sense of the word—*i.e.*, he attempts to show that by the ordinary standards of historical criticism the Gospels, in so far as they can be checked, are true to historical fact and make no serious error. This is, of course, mere hewing of wood and drawing of water; but so long as such a tiresome theory as the Christ Myth is still in circulation it is useful to have someone of the calibre of Professor H. G. Wood who is patient enough to deal with it; and so long as criticism diffuses a widespread but ill-defined mistrust of the Gospels, which is a factor too often underrated by the theologian, it is useful to have at one's disposal all the arguments that can be stated in favour of the historical accuracy of the Gospels. The author has read widely, knows his authorities well, and has done his work competently within its limits. Nevertheless the main impression left by this book is that there is too much special pleading in it. On such questions as the authorship of the Gospels, the identification of the Matthæan Logia with Q, the value of St Luke's preface, Ignatius' knowledge of the Fourth Gospel, and the discrepancies between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics, the author is confident just where the critics are most hesitant, while his defence of such incidents as the Coin in the Fish's Mouth is far from convincing. If, as the author himself notes, the professional theologian is apt to be more sceptical than the professional historian, this is presumably because the theologian is driven to a more exacting technique of criticism by the fact that the Gospels are not written purely as historical documents. In the question which the author supplies as his title there is another question latent, "Reliable as what?"

It is from this point, as the title of his book suggests, that Professor Tasker begins. For him the best kind of defence is attack, and the best form of apologetic is exposition. He gives full weight to the theological nature of the Gospels, while seeking "to preserve such results

of the older type of criticism as seem still to be valid." The result is far more convincing. After a short account of the oral preaching as determining the shape of the written Gospels, he gives excellent, though all too brief, statements of the nature of St Mark's Gospel and of the "Q" material. The chapter on the Gospel of Matthew is perhaps the best and most sympathetic short account of the subject in English, and it is exciting to find someone who, while he does not gloze over the defects of "Matthew," would choose this Gospel if he were allowed to possess only one out of the four. If St Luke receives harder treatment the reasons for it are clearly stated. The two chapters on The Kingdom of God in Jewish Expectation and The Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Gospels provide both an able summary of, and a leading thread through, this important theme in its long development. The chapter on the Fourth Gospel is too short for an adequate treatment of the question it raises of the relation between historical fact and theological interpretation. In an appendix there is a spirited attack upon the policy of exempting ordinands from the study of Greek.

The greater part of Professor Tasker's book was delivered as lectures to teachers and clergy, and, slender as it is, it should receive the widest possible circulation among those to whom it is addressed. There are not many books on the Gospels which can be recommended *in toto* and without reservations to those who have neither the time nor perhaps the training to exercise careful discrimination in what they read, but this is one of them. There is nothing strikingly novel in it, but there is a balanced unity running through it, which is achieved without special pleading, and which illustrates the motto from T. H. Green printed at the beginning: "The purpose of all true thought is to distinguish without dividing, and to unite without unifying." It should be read not only widely but also with attention. "From the very beginning, then, I believe the story of His death was told, not in isolation, but as the climax of the life which preceded it, and that there was therefore from the beginning a motive for keeping alive the record of His deeds and sayings" (p. 14). ". . . it must be admitted that the Evangelist's use of the Old Testament has not that penetrating insight which characterized Jesus' use of it" (p. 39). "It is important to notice that the modern tendency to Marcionism has gone hand-in-hand with an exaggerated estimation of the importance of the Gospel of Luke" (p. 48). "For if the significance and importance of Jesus of Nazareth was not what the Fourth Gospel claims it to have been, it is difficult to understand not only why it could ever have been placed alongside the other three, but why those other three should ever have been written or preserved" (p. 98). These, and other sentences like them, should not be read casually and passed over; they represent mature and considered judgments which clearly have a great deal lying behind them. It is very much to be hoped that Professor Tasker will write another and much bigger book on this subject.

C. F. Evans.

Lincoln.

THE FREE CHURCH TRADITION IN THE LIFE OF ENGLAND. By Ernest A. Payne. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

THE SILENT CHURCH: THE PROBLEM OF THE GERMAN CONFESSIONAL WITNESS. By Julius Rieger. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.

Mr Payne has written a competent and readable chronicle of the history of the Free Church tradition and of its decline in the twentieth century. This decline he thinks a bad thing which should be stopped. He is quite right in saying that existing presentations of Free Church principles are all pre-1914 and that we need something up to date. His perspective may be gauged from his chapter headings:—Protest: The Beginnings of Free Church Witness; Struggle: The Seventeenth Century; Recognition: 1689-1750; Revival: Wesley and His Contemporaries; Expansion: The Era of Napoleon and the Industrial Revolution; Confidence: The Victorian Age; Hesitancy: 1900-39. Mr Payne's chronicle is adequately documented, and it should prove a useful simple statement of the history of Nonconformity. Two comments may be in order. I should myself want a more definite treatment of the fact that the primary theological and ecclesiastical reality is the separate denominations, and that "the Free Church tradition" is a natural grouping for certain purposes. This is the more urgent if in the Free Church tradition one includes Unitarianism, to which Mr Payne exhibits an oddly vacillating attitude with no understanding of the aversion of the older Dissent; the reason is, I imagine, that he has not made up his mind whether he is applying a cultural or a theological judgment. Secondly, the rehabilitation of the Free Church tradition which Mr Payne desires can only come as the result of a profound theological reassessment which sets the perspective of the past and claims the pattern of the future. His book may well serve a useful purpose in helping to evoke such a theological reassessment, but it is not itself an expression of that reassessment taking shape. A much deeper perspective is hinted at in Dr Lovell Cocks' little book *The Nonconformist Conscience.*

Mr Payne says, and rightly, that the Free Churches are as "English" as the Church of England. But is that a help when it comes to witnessing to the Gospel? This question is raised in one's mind by Dr Rieger's book, which asks the question whether the Confessing Church of Germany has made a true witness to the Gospel of Christ. The book is an interesting documented statement of some of the evidence at present available. It is by no means necessary to agree at all points either with Dr Rieger or with the Confessing Church, provided we face two questions. First, what has it meant to be the Christian Church in Germany rightly sharing in the life and thought of the German people? (One of our chief difficulties is in allowing the German Confessing Church to be German. "If only they had a decent English tradition," we think. But might not that too have its limitations?) Second, what does it mean for a Christian Church to confess Christ? If the problem of Dr Rieger's book were applied to the material of Mr Payne's book (or, for that matter, to any study of the history of the Church of England) the result would be rather disconcerting.

Anyway, it is to be hoped that many will listen to and try to understand Dr Rieger's book, not only for the sake of our Christian brethren in Germany, but also for the sake of the witness of the Christian Church in England.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

Bradford.

The Christian Estimate of Man. By Sydney Cave. Duckworth. Studies in Theology Series. 6s.

Principal Cave has followed up his earlier handbooks on the Doctrines of the Person and of the Work of Christ in this series with what he describes as a "brief summary" of lectures on the Christian Estimate of Man. One suspects that the lectures have suffered much in the process of compression. The method is historical, and conclusions for the most part have to emerge from the story of what Christian thinkers have said in various theological contexts, particularly those of sin, election and grace. The disadvantages of this method are most conspicuous when Dr Cave contents himself, as in the case of St Thomas, with a series of quotations which must be more or less unintelligible to anyone who is not familiar with the leading thought-forms of Thomist philosophy. There is nothing at all in this chapter to suggest the tremendous revolution which St Thomas's Aristotelianism necessitated in the Christian answer to the question: "What is man?" Again, no one would suspect, from the two pages allowed to Origen or the twenty given to Augustine, that these two giants of the patristic age were between them laying the foundations of a Christian understanding of human freedom.

Dr Cave's main thesis is that the "treasure" of the Christian estimate of man, which is essentially a consequence of the Christian doctrine of God in Christ, has been carried in the "earthen vessels" of a theory of man's origin, or a rationalization of the religious experience of individuals like Augustine or Calvin, which is in conflict with modern knowledge and the modern conscience; and that this has had results the more unfortunate because it is inevitably on the anthropological ground that Christianity comes most directly into contact with the non-theistic thought of recent times. Dr Cave is at his best in his treatment of the modern period, from Schleiermacher to Brunner. He does not refer to Niebuhr, the second volume of whose Gifford Lectures did not appear until after his own book was written. It is evidently with Brunner that his own theological sympathies lie. But his book would have been more effective if it had set forth with a clearer emphasis the *two* facts about man which are the *foci* of Brunner's, as they must be of any genuinely Christian, anthropology—namely, that man is first and foremost the handiwork of God's creative love, and only secondly a sinner against the love which has created him. It has been the attempt to establish some rational link between these two facts that has produced all the worst aberrations from a Christian estimate of man. At the present time, we are in no danger of forgetting man's sinfulness; but we badly need a fresh understanding of what it means to be God's creatures.

If Dr Cave's useful little book is reprinted, it is to be hoped that he will revise the translations from the Fathers. It is not fair on Tertullian and Augustine to perpetuate the inaccuracies of the *Ante-Nicene Library* and the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*.

J. Burnaby.

Trinity College,
Cambridge.

Paul Among the Jews. By Franz Werfel. Grey Walls Press. 6s.

Three Poems. By Fred Marneau, Wrey Gardiner, Nicholas Moore. Grey Walls Press. 2s. 6d.

Sons of Adam. By Philip J. Lamb. The Sheldon Press. 1s. 6d.

The Wounds of the Apostles. By Fred Marneau. Grey Walls Press. 7s. 6d.

The danger of historic drama is that it will reduce an age in world history either to an evening's entertainment or a piece of propaganda; and when religion gets mixed up with it the danger is increased four-fold because eternal truths are likely to be at stake. Some dramatists avoid this—Paul Claudel and T. S. Eliot, for instance—by sublimating historic themes into spiritual conflicts. The difference is not unlike the difference between prose and poetry, which may account for the fact that such drama is essentially poetic. The same might be said of Franz Werfel's *Paul Among the Jews*. This play was produced at the Burg Theatre in Vienna nearly twenty years ago; and the Grey Walls Press have now produced a long-overdue authorized translation of the German by Paul Levertoff. There is, as one would expect, as much philosophy as drama in the picture; and the struggle between Paul and the Jews is disclosed in the great epoch-making conflict between Paul and the old Saul—though couched in terms of theology rather than of psychology. This play should certainly find a home on the London stage when it blossoms out again into "little" theatre movements of the experimental kind.

Another Grey Walls Press publication is of *Three Poems*, by Fred Marneau, Wrey Gardiner and Nicholas Moore, respectively; but why this rather scrappy edition—and why together? They are all poets of established reputation who do not need publication in *apéritif* form, nor do they speak with one voice. Indeed, Wrey Gardiner's poem would seem to be cantos from a larger work. It is all rather mysterious; but the poems make pleasant enough reading, though one feels, on concluding them, that one has taken angular glimpses at three uncommon minds rather than felt the might of any one of them—which is a pity when one remembers what these particular minds are capable of expending.

The Sheldon Plays have been appearing for some time, and they may be said to be doing a good domestic job for religious drama in the country. The latest to appear is *Sons of Adam*, by Philip J. Lamb —a meditation on our Lord's Nativity, partly in verse but largely in dramatic dialogue. It seldom achieves the height of poetry; but the ideas are uttered with a pleasing tautness compared with the rather

woolly diction of so much devotional drama. The play (also unlike most of its kind) is unbroken by suggestions for carols, hymns or Christmas music, and is home-brewed in these respects. It may certainly be said to possess a homogeneous pattern and might go well as a broadcast.

The first selection of Fred Marneau's poems in book form is an event of literary interest; and the Grey Walls Press are to be congratulated upon their timely production of *The Wounds of the Apostles*. Nor do the poems, thanks to Ernst Sigler, read like translations. There is a remarkable integrity in the language and a depth of strange inevitability which seldom comes from thought that has gone through the sieve of translation. Marneau's technique (unlike that of many moderns) is warm and compelling, and the passion in his utterance is tempered with a fine austerity. Perhaps his German origin has saved him from the influence of Hopkins, which—however great a poet Hopkins may have been—has "artificialized" some of the moderns. *Requiem for Helge*, *Air*, and the *Sonnet*, perhaps, show Fred Marneau at his characteristic best. *The Wounds of the Apostles* itself is a wonderful distillation of fire and ice in a dramatic unity—perhaps the greatest achievement of its kind since Blake. In all these poems the English and German are given on opposite pages—a surely rather laboured and extravagant device!

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

A BOOK OF WORDS FOR PADRES SERVING THE ROYAL AIR FORCE. By R. L. Gerrard Wright. S.P.C.K. 5s.

Mr Gerrard Wright, who is an Assistant Chaplain-in-Chief in the R.A.F., has written an unambitious and useful book containing practical information and advice which will be of particular value to those entering upon the service with which he is directly concerned. But the book might also be read with profit by parish clergy, not only for the sake of an excellent chapter on the technique of preaching, but because it will provide some insight into the peculiar environment and problems of the service chaplain. There has been much criticism of the Chaplains' Departments, some of it just, but a great deal of it uninformed. It will be well that clergy in general should possess the understanding which reading a book of this kind is likely to engender. The present reviewer disagrees wholly with the author on the vexed questions of compulsory church parades and the status of chaplains, but is fain to confess that they are here discussed with moderation and fairness. There are warnings against most of the pitfalls, but no mention is made of the temptation—perhaps the most prevalent of all—to "breeziness." Indeed, the book itself occasionally, but only occasionally, falls into this snare with the usual unfortunate results. A "breezy" use of words with so solemn a connotation as "vicarious propitiatory sacrifice" will jar on many. But this is not the tone of Mr Wright's book, which may be recommended to all who have pastoral responsibilities of whatever kind.

FRANK BENNETT.

NESTON-IN-WIRRAL.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Editor has sent me a peculiar assortment of literature. First comes a set of penny pamphlets called *Pastoral Series*, issued by the Modern Churchmen's Union. There are nine of them. They may well persuade men and women to incline to a closer attachment to the Church, for they are well written and reasonable. But more positive teaching will be needed to convert that inclination into movement. For the reasonableness of these pamphlets owes too much to the fact that they minimize the supernatural element in Christianity. Thus Dr Major answers the question, "Why baptize infants?" without so much as mentioning the word "regeneration"; and the Bishop of Truro, in the most insipid pamphlets of the set, explains faith as an assent to certain propositions. But I would not condemn the series on these grounds. Provided that their limitations are recognized they may do useful work.

Next comes *One Bread, One Body*, by Ronald Dix (The Pax House, 1s.). The author belongs to so strait a sect of one party of the Church of England as to be unaware that others exist. He unchurches many, if not most, Anglicans in a sweeping sentence: "The Church of England teaches that the body of the Catholic Church consists of all who accept the four essential characteristics of Catholicism: the Creeds, the Bible, the Seven Sacraments, and what is called the Apostolic Tradition. . . . Anyone who does not accept these four essential characteristics we regard as being separated from the body of the Church" (pp. 6, 7). And again: "The first of the six precepts of the Church is to be present at the Eucharist on all Sundays and other holy days of obligation" (p. 12). Despite this rigidity of outlook, however, the essay is worthy of attention. It is a study of the corporate unity of the Church and of the Eucharist. Much is packed into a small space without loss of lucidity, and it provokes to constructive thought.

The Synopsis given at the beginning of *Spiritual Direction*, by Sybil Harton (Mowbrays, 1s 9d.), provides a good summary of a wise book. "What is direction: distinction between director and confessor: who needs direction: and when: by whom it should be given: characteristics of wise direction: effects of wise direction: obligations incurred: the relationship and its responsibility."

Daffodils in Bermondsey, by Arthur Sinker (Mowbrays, 3s. 6d.), consists of material published in Bermondsey Parish Magazine. Generally speaking, extracts from parish magazines find a wider public only because they are ridiculous. But these are of a different order. They are witty little essays born of a pastoral heart and of keen observation of human nature. They have that kind of warm gaiety which comes of belief in the doctrine of Original Sin and in the Gospel of Redemption.

The last book in this batch, *Joking Apart*, by Ronald Sinclair (3s. 6d.), is published by Mowbrays. One wonders why. It is an uneven book, swinging from impassioned rhetoric to shallow criticism, from exhortation to a dreary levity. Two pages from the end the author exclaims: "How platitudinous all this sounds. How often we have heard it." This self-criticism is just.

F. C. Synge.

London.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

A.P.C.K., Dublin: *A Guild of Youth Handbook* (2s.).

From the Author, St John's Clergy House, Backworth, Northumberland: F. H. Mountney, *The Order of the Mass in the English Church* (3d.).

Blackfriars: D. J. B. Hawkins, *The Problem of Christian Humanism* (1s.); F. C. Copleston, S.J., *St Thomas and Nietzsche* (1s.); F. S. Taylor, *The Attitude of St Thomas to Natural Science* (2s.).

Blackwell: *Some Comparison between Universities* (2s. 6d.).

Geoffrey Bles: J. Maritain, *The Rights of Man* (5s.); C. S. Lewis, *Beyond Personality* (2s. 6d.).

Burns Oates: J. Lebreton and J. Zeiller, *The History of the Primitive Church*, Vol. II (18s.); F. R. Hoare, *Original Order and Chapters of St John's Gospel* (10s. 6d.); W. B. Dyer, *All ye that Pass By* (2s. 6d.).

Cresset Press: E. Cammaerts, *The Flower of Grass* (6s.).

Dacre Press: T. Jalland, *The Bible, the Church and South India* (5s.); J. A. Robinson, *The Apostolic Succession* (9d.); Dom Gregory Dix, *The Question of Anglican Orders* (4s. 6d.).

Andrew Dakers: J. M. Murry, *Adam and Eve* (10s. 6d.).

Europa Publications: *Tomorrow's Children* (1s.).

Faber and Faber: E. Lampert, *The Divine Realm* (8s. 6d.).

Inter-Varsity Fellowship: H. A. E. Hopkins, *The Inadequacy of Non-Christian Religions* (1s. 6d.).

Iona Community: G. F. MacLeod, *We Shall Rebuild* (n.p.).

Longmans: A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The World's Question and the Christian Answer* (4s. 6d.); E. Underhill, *Light of Christ* (5s.).

Lutterworth Press: F. Hildebrandt, *This is the Message* (4s. 6d.); F. L. Coutts, *The Timeless Prophets* (3s.); *The Predicament of the Church*, Essays by A. D. Lindsay and others (8s. 6d.).

Macmillan: A. T. Macmillan, *What is Christian Marriage?* (8s. 6d.).

Marshall, Morgan and Scott: M. Warren, *But Suppose he was Right* (2s.).

Mowbrays: P. Green, *The Pre-Mundane Fall* (1s. 6d.).

National Society and S.P.C.K.: W. H. Oldaker, *The Background of the Life of Jesus* (3s. 6d.); N. L. Pritchard, *The Presentation of the Old Testament* (3s.); Basil F. L. Clarke, *Clement Joins the Church* (3s. 6d.).

Nisbet: O. C. Quick, *The Gospel of the New World* (6s. 6d.).

Oxford University Press: Lord Eustace Percy, *The Unknown State* (2s. 6d.).

S.C.M. Press: H. F. D. Sparks, *The Old Testament in the Christian Church* (6s.).

S.P.C.K.: A. J. Macdonald, *The Interpreter Spirit* (6s.); H. R. T. Brandreth and S. Bailey, *Celibacy and Marriage* (2s.); Bishop E. J. Palmer (Chairman), *Dispensation* (7s. 6d.); C. W. Dugmore (Ed.), *The Interpretation of the Bible* (6s.); W. K. L. Clarke, *Eighteenth Century Piety* (10s. 6d.); W. J. Sparrow Simpson, *St Augustine's Episcopate* (7s. 6d.); J. R. Brown, *Number One Millbank* (1s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher